DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 032 065 JC 690 327

Planning for Development; Selected Proceedings of the National Conference of the American Association of Junior Colleges (Warrenton, Virginia, June 13-16, 1968).
American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C. Program with Developing Institutions.
Pub Date [68]
Note-60p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.10
Descriptors-Conferences, *Junior Colleges, Workshops
Identifiers-*American Association of Junior Colleges, Program with Developing Institutions

From the conference proceedings, certain main topics were chosen for this re, ort. They include: Paul Miller's talk on the changing structure of higher education; a session with three U.S. Office of Education personnel on the submission of sound proposals for obtaining federal funds; William G. Shannon's speech on just what a developing college is; John P. Mallan's comments on federal programs for junior colleges; Robert P. Malcolm's address on the AAJC Facilities Information Service; remarks from Gilbert Saunders on the Occupational Education Project; and Derek S. Singer's talk on faculty and manpower considerations for developing colleges. This part is followed by a synopsis of a panel discussion on certain areas of responsibility, such as the role of the trustee, of the president, and of the consultant. Highlights of 18 specialized workshops are also presented. Their subjects were the administration of both community and private junior colleges, financial needs and sources, faculty manpower and resources, faculty orientation, curriculum development (academic, remedial, and individualized instruction), occupational education (in general, its development, business programs, and a summary), institutional research, student personnel services (in general and in relation to "student power"), and community relations (public service, basic problems, and communication problems). Also given are excerpts from Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr.'s comprehensive address on the changing 2-year college. (HH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED032065

PLANNING FOR DEVELOPMENT

Selected Proceedings
of the National Conference

American Association of Junior Colleges
Program With Developing Institutions

JC 690 327

Airlie House
Warrenton, Virginia
13-16 June 1968

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

SEP 15 1969

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

American Association of Junior Colleges
1315 Sixteenth Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Printed in U.S.A.

CONTENTS

Page

"The Changing Structure of Higher Education"by Dr. Paul Miller. . 5

U. S. Office of Education Session. 9

"What is a Developing College?" by Dr. William G. Shannon. . . 12

"Federal Programs for Junior Colleges" by Dr. John P. Mallan . . 16

"Facilities Information Service" by Robert B. Malcolm. . . . 17

"Occupational Education Project" by Gilbert Saunders 17

"Faculty and Manpower Considerations for Developing Colleges" by Derek S. Singer . . . 18

"Areas of Responsibility" - (Panel Discussions) 26

Specialized Workshops: Summaries

1. Administration: Community Colleges 28
2. Administration: Private Colleges 29
3. Administration: Financial Aid 30
4. Faculty Manpower and Resources 31
5. Faculty Orientation. 36
6. Curriculum Development: Academic 37
7. Curriculum Development: Remedial 38
8. Curriculum Development: Individualized Instruction . . 40
9. Occupational Education 41
10. Occupational Program Development. 42
11. Occupational Education: Business Programs 44
12. Occupational Education Summary 44
13. Institutional Research 45
14. Student Personnel Services 47
15. Student Personnel: "Student Power" 49
16. Community Relations: Public Service. 50
17. Community Relations: Basic Problems. 52
18. Community Relations: Communication Problems. . . . 53

"Our Changing Two-Year Colleges" by Dr. Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr. . 54

INTRODUCTION

The American Association of Junior Colleges Program With Developing Institutions, developed in cooperation with the U.S. Office of Education Division of College Support and financed under Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965, went into action with a three-day conference on Planning for Development at Airlie House in Warrenton, Virginia. Invited were 72 members of the program's consulting panel of consultants, and two representatives from each of the 85 colleges participating in the program--including presidents, deans, and some 23 trustees of the colleges involved. A wide variety of problems and possible solutions came under discussion during the sessions.

It was not our intention to publish the complete proceedings of this conference but some of the presentations and workshop summaries were so interesting that many colleges and consultants requested copies of them. As a means of recording the "cream" of the conference, therefor we have drawn together selected papers and summaries of the workshop sessions as reported by recorders at the final session of the conference.

This little book is intended primarily for the member colleges and consultants in this program, as a means of preserving some of the ide fielded at the Airlie Conference.

It is hoped this record will be of use to all those involved in the program, and to others interested in the problems of developing colleges.

SELDEN MENEFEE
Program Director

THE CHANGING STRUCTURE OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Dr. Paul Miller
Assistant Secretary for Education

(Excerpts from an informal talk at the AAJC Conference on Planning for Development, Airlie House, Warrenton, Virginia, June 13, 1968)

Introduction by Dr. Willa Player, Director, Division of College Support, USOE

Dr. Miller:

...It seems to me that leaders of the community college movement are really confronting three ideas. The first is--what are the consequences of growth? The second concerns the place of the community college in the whole system of post-secondary higher education in the United States. What is it going to be? What does it look like for the long haul? Where do we stand today? The third, it seems to me, is the notion of style--the spirit, the mood of inventiveness that goes along with your place in the structure of higher education in the country. It seems to me that these three concepts will keep emerging in your workshops as you go along in your planning.

We are facing a changing structure and meaning of higher education in America and, as well perhaps all around the world. We are going through a great reorganization of power throughout the structure of higher education. Many of the pressures upon institutions are bringing about a curious interplay of forces between them and society. I doubt if our institutions of higher learning can ever be the same again. What we have often thought of as prestige in higher education will not mean quite the same thing; and support and the action will not necessarily be where the prestige has been.

Some of the most prestigious institutions in this country have become anachronistic. Located in places where the community is neither typical or real, they cannot always find substitutes. Even the prestigious institutions are having difficulty getting enough money, and sometimes they have been forced to make new accomodations to receive support, giving them a new lustiness, an adventurousness that we haven't seen before.

The reallocation of power and prestige, money and the structure of education is underway and it is relevant to community colleges. If you look at higher education as a national system, it is very distinctive in that it is the only national sector in modern society that determines the need for and produces the personnel that staff its own system; in short, it has monopoly control, in establishing the credentials, in producing the people, rewarding them and sending them into, the elites of society. In other words, education is the one sector that controls its own qualities of leadership. This gives education a distinctive attribute as a system. The way to look at it is as a series of concentric circles. In the middle of this series of circles is the university graduate school which determines to a large degree the nature of the people who flow out through the whole system. Next to this are the four-year colleges. The next circles include the two-year colleges. Then one has a number of technical institutions, private business schools, and other educational activities sponsored by business or by the professional life of the community. The latter activities are beginning to confuse the traditional control over the production of personnel and defining their credentials, at the center.

It is important to point out that the only way you can change higher education is either to change the center of the model, the university graduate centers, or to change the more peripheral regions of the system which are close to the community with new influence flowing back to the center.

The junior or community college, 900 strong and growing at the rate of fifty or more a year, is destined to have one out of every two students entering colleges and universities in this country. The community college is becoming the new sensitive agent on the firing line, very close to the cutting edge of the society in a position to flash signals back through this vast structure. The community college, with its style and role being what it is, adds a quite sensitive element to the system of higher education. This is true because messages are flowing to the center of the system which trains the leadership and the elites, which in the past have tended to influence the entire enterprise.

There is a new "extension of professionalism in American society," not only in the changes of the occupational structure from blue collar workers to professional workers and service people, but in every walk of life; and this, too, is beginning to send its messages back into the higher education system. One of the problems today is the gap between university graduate centers and the new professional and ethical situation in the community. Communication is bad. Thus, it seems to me that the community college has a very important role to play in the future of American education. We have had similar changes prior to the rise of the land grant institutions, the old teacher colleges, the regional colleges and universities. And now, from the grass roots, comes this burgeoning, growing movement, never quite sure of itself, to give fresh interpretations to educational needs.

The urban university is not very self-conscious about its connections with the surrounding community. Not that they have to have such linkages, but our institutions are not thinking about them enough, and they are not designing new ones. Again, I come back to the model and the need of agencies in society to send back messages to the centers which produce leadership. The community college must bring into its planning a self-consciousness, a deliberateness about horizontal linkages with the community, because all higher education depends upon the sensitivity and the intelligence with which you experience the reality of American society. New community colleges, close as they are to the realities of life, must realize that our technology is far beyond the point of use. It is now necessary and possible for the whole community to realize the benefits of the community college, and other institutions of higher learning as well. Any new institution being planned from the grass roots must think through modern telecommunication and how best to relate to the community, to every cultural center, even to families. Telecommunication must be built into our institutions or we will do less than we know about how to relate ourselves to the process of learning. The classroom is now declining as the center of education and the community as a whole is taking its place. This is an exciting breakthrough, especially for institutions like yours.

We have in our country no really well developed research and development system in education. We have it in defense, we have it in health, we have it in agriculture and certainly we have it in industry. The largest single industry in this country which has not fully thought out the R & D process is education.

We have started here and there, with the regional laboratories, for example, but the community colleges, given wise planning, could be sensitive, intelligent agents of R & D in American education, both in lower and higher education.

I spoke of the need for horizontal linkages with the community. There is an equal need for vertical linkages with the secondary schools and to the rest of higher education. I understand why, in the emergence of community colleges, there is a certain amount of reluctance about being too closely related to the secondary schools. I understand some of the difficulties which lie in the relationship of the community colleges and other institutions of higher education. But as a result -- and this has to do with the place of the community college which is the second of my three concepts -- the vertical linkages are also crucial. I think the community colleges must somehow work for a new kind of confidence that relates on the one hand to the four-year colleges and universities and their resources; they must learn to feel comfortable with both. I think this is a central planning problem of the newly emerging community colleges of our time. If you want to feel saddened, go to some of the inner-city areas of America and talk to university and college people. You will find too little concern for the lower schools given the desperate plight of urban elementary and secondary schools.

The central imperative of post-secondary education will become more and more the extent to which it uses the resources efficiently and fully. I would hope that community colleges, soon to become 1000 strong, and having such a big share of the total system will show how resources can be jointly used through consortia, telecommunications and other techniques. I am quite sure that the public will not any longer stand for our turning aside from the question, "are you using your resources at your disposal as efficiently as you know how?" Cries of academic freedom and institutional autonomy will not suffice as answers.

In short, it seems crucial that the community college means what it says in the way of community education. It will be linked with lower education and at the same time be responsive to and a contributor to the whole framework of higher education.

Starting after World War II, one of the unintended consequences of Federal support to institutions of higher learning was that so many people told us that the world depended upon higher education, that the last best hope of man lay in higher education. We started to believe it! Indeed, we came to believe it so much that we took much of what we were doing at home for granted. As a result, the institution of higher learning is one of the most powerful institutions of American society instrumentally speaking, and increasingly weakened on the integrated side -- the side where students, faculty and administrators find ways of conducting mutual tasks together. This is a great challenge to all of us, and it must be part of your plans.

You will have the problems of various roles -- personnel systems, the role of presidents, the role of trustees and others. You are trying to do something in your planning that most of us in higher education have forgotten about -- that is, "to worry about the integrated mechanisms of a collegial community." As a result of emphasis on physical expansion, we have often neglected those relationships that are the instruments of communication within the institutions.

My final point has to do with the whole matter of looking at your institution in systemic terms, and that means another way of looking at resource allocation.

I think when the real breakthrough in federal support of higher education comes, it will be at the level of institutional grants to institutions of higher learning. I think they will be slanted toward doing what we have not done by federal support in recent years, and that is, operating with an eye toward improving the quality of undergraduate instruction. When the time comes, the government will no doubt demand a more rational approach to the use of resources. My guess is that in any federal support program of institutional aid, the colleges will be given great freedom as to how it is spent; but there will be some strings attached in reference to productivity. Already, a new language is beginning to appear in the forward planning of colleges and universities. We are beginning to see an institution in juxtaposition with others, with the lower schools, as I've said, and with the other centers of higher learning and other sources in the community. These will all be more fully used, and characterized by more cooperative sharing.

U. S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION SESSION
Airlie House, June 14, 1968

Dr. Calvin B. T. Lee, Assistant Director, Division of College Support, said that the "5-E Program" (Education Professions Development Act) has as its aim bringing together the graduate schools and the junior colleges, to help fill the faculty manpower needs of the two-year colleges. These needs, he said, are not well known; junior colleges have had to take their instructors from where they could find them. "It will take three to five years for the graduate schools to tune in to the needs that exist," he said. "We must know more about the needs of higher education."

"This program (developing institutions)," said Lee, "aims at encouraging a reassessment of the role of the individual junior college in terms of meaningful goals and objectives. Out of this, the U.S. Office of Education will gain much knowledge about how to meet junior college needs.

***

Dr. Charles E. Hayes, Chief of the Developing Institutions Branch, listed some of the problems his office had encountered in funding Title III applications. The quality of proposals, he said, had not improved from year to year, and with only $6.6 million available for the junior colleges "we must use the money wisely." Under Title III, 411 institutions were funded last year, he said, but it was apparent that many colleges did not know how to meet their own needs. For example, 1541 National Teaching Fellowships were awarded last year, but less than half were actually appointed in the first semester; and at the end of the second semester, some 200 had still not been awarded. So the number awarded was reduced this year.

"We felt we had to do better," said Dr. Hayes. "Accordingly, we needled AAJC to come up with a plan which would serve more institutions, and help them to plan for improvement. This program makes us hopeful that we shall receive better proposals next year.

"Over 500 applications were received from all colleges this year, totalling many times the $30 million available," said Dr. Hayes. A total of 3,342 National Teaching Fellows were requested; one college asked for 41 NTF's, for a faculty of 213 persons. So the policy adopted was that under no circumstances should the number of NTF's run above 10 percent of the faculty; and preference was given to fellowships matched with faculty development -- such as replacements for faculty members sent off for additional training -- rather than fellowships simply for building faculty.

Last year 411 institutions received grants, but this year the number was reduced to 220, thereby making available larger average grants for individual institutions in the Program. "We feel that institutional grants should be larger than they have been in the past," said Dr. Hayes, so that they can have more impact. But with 211 applications from junior colleges alone, only 65 of which were granted, we fell back on this AAJC program to spread some of the money more widely and help a larger number of junior colleges.

***

Dr. David W. Smith, Education Specialist and liaison man for the AAJC Program with Developing Institutions, said that the objective of the program is to help the junior colleges plan a viable future for themselves, not simply to help them write better proposals for Title III assistance. "We do expect that another $30 millions

will be appropriated for the coming year," he said, "so it may be useful to review some of the reasons proposals are not funded - or rather, to take a positive approach, let me pinpoint the essential ingredients of a good proposal."

There are three main elements to a good proposal, Dr. Smith said:

"1. The problem you are concerned with. Curriculum development, faculty development or whatever it is, should be stated clearly and concisely.

"2. The approach to the problem. The Federal government cannot recognize your problems - you must show the initiative. You must also consider the cost of your proposal solution - the amount of money necessary and just how it is to be spent.

"3. The competence of your institution to solve your problem. What is the competence of the people who will be involved? What has been done so far toward a solution?"

Dr. Smith then summarized his division's reasons for rejecting Title III applications as follows:

1. A third of the applications were rejected because of a lack of significance of the problem. Either the problem was not considered sufficiently important to justify the expenditure asked, or the approach appeared unlikely to produce any useful information or results.

2. The proposal did not present sufficient evidence of the soundness of the approach, or it was based on doubtful or unsound information.

3. The methods or procedures were inadequate to cope with the problem or unsuited to the objectives stated. The description of the approach to the problem was too nebulous, too unclear. "Do you have the experience to do the job? Can you find an able project coordinator? These are the questions that must be answered in the proposal. You must be realistic about salaries, both for the prospective National Teaching Fellow and the program coordinator. In today's market, a program coordinator right out of graduate school can, with a year or so of experience, command a salary of $17,500."

4. The proposal is outside the scope of Title III. "We still get some proposals like this," said Dr. Smith. "You must read the instructions. If you are in doubt, you can refer to the Congressional hearings to find the intent of Congress. Your project officer should be able to do this."

He added these hints:

1. You should have a master plan and all proposals should mesh with this. "We have found in some instances that the president may not always be aware of the various projects the institution has under consideration for federal assistance."

2 Within the Office of Education, the staff and readers of proposals are subject to a rapid turnover. Other conditions change too, and it is quite possible that a proposal which was turned down last year may be acceptable next year, if properly presented.

3. Check the figures submitted in your proposal so that they are consistent with those inserted on the application form by your business office. A lack of consistency can contribute to the rejection of a proposal.

4. The human factor is important. You must impress the reader or evaluator, and you can do this best by being clear and concise.

5. Title III is a program which applies to all 50 states, but last year proposals were received from only 45 states. Several states, notably in New England, were not represented among the institutions receiving grants. The geographical factor is a consideration in the evaluation of proposals.

***

SOME QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q. Which kind of application is preferred--bilateral, or consortium?

Hayes: The institution should make its own choice. But we want institutions to get together wherever possible--especially the weaker ones--to spread the benefits of the Title III program. You should link up with other, stronger institutions which can help you to meet your needs--your chances will be better this way.

Lee: If colleges join together, we can meet more needs with the limited finances we have. We can't defend an individual college proposal which amounts to $3,000 or more per student.

Q. What is the responsibility of the Federal government to help the colleges to write proposals?

Smith: The question is really how much aid should the Federal government give and in what way. We must be fair to all, not give special aid to individual institutions.

Q. To what extent should a college hire professionals to write proposals?

Smith: It is not necessary -- sometimes it is even undesirable if the proposal reflects professional "grantsmanship" which is unrealistic in terms of the capacity of the institution. You don't need a literary gem; clarity is more important.

WHAT IS A DEVELOPING COLLEGE?

Dr. William G. Shannon
Associate Executive Director, AAJC

(Speech presented at "Developing Institutions" Conference
General Session, June 14, 1968)

We all would like to think that every college is a developing college, but that would be stretching a point. Of course, every institution represented here is technically and officially a developing college because all fit the legal definition established by Congress for the purposes of Title III of the HEA.

If the Act had been drawn up six or seven years ago, the phrase might have been "underdeveloped," but that is hardly an appealing label. If the Act were to be re-written today, Congress might consider calling them "emerging" institutions, paralleling the term used for nations that are moving ahead technologically and in other ways.

The terms can fit both nations and colleges but I think you would agree that just as all nations can't really be classified as "developing" or "emerging," so not all colleges can be so dubbed; yet on the other hand, I wouldn't hesitate to say that all colleges, just as all nations, are never fully developed.

I don't want to play around with words, nevertheless, when Congress stipulated that, to be eligible for Title III funds, a college must be "striving to improve," it emphasized the right note. It would be gratifying to think that all colleges were "striving to improve" but we haven't reached that stage yet. When the Act goes on to request participating institutions to be (a) five years old, (b) accredited, or on the way to that happy state, and (c) isolated from the main currents of academic life, it spells out who can join the club and what the price of admission is.

A little history might be helpful to our discussion. We are told that initially the bill was drafted by several congressmen who became especially concerned about the poor condition of most Negro colleges and decided to do something about it. They wanted to provide federal money to encourage these institutions to develop self-improvement programs, to work harder because they were not number one. In many cases, they were not even number 1001, considering there are over 2500 institutions of higher education and most of the colleges Congress had in mind were well below average in many respects.

Fortunately Congress came to realize that poverty of spirit and substance can affect white as well as black institutions, along with those of mixed coloration. So now all these categories are beneficiaries of congressional concern. No type of college, black or white, holds a monopoly on inferiority. Perhaps symbolically, like the universal blood in homo sapiens, red ink skeins through the financial reports of all colleges regardless of race, creed or national origin. So the bill was changed in committee to provide more comprehensive coverage--it's good and democratic and besides, the bill would have a better chance of passing because no white congressmen would now feel obliged to vote against it. After all, the black power block in Congress is still shy a few votes from being a vote-swing majority.

But there was another problem. When you start a federal program to assist developing colleges and you open it up to all Negro and all white colleges, how many colleges can legally be left out?

If you give federal money to all colleges that can swear in quadruplicate they are "striving to improve," this country (and especially the Bureau of the Budget) could go broke as each college strove to show Congress that it was trying harder than anybody else, that it alone deserved to be given the "best striver of the year award" every year the national treasury happened to be solvent.

Thinking fast, the drafting committee decided they had better refine their definition of a developing college or they wouldn't have enough money left to attach more office space to the U. S. Capitol or to build and stock that $10 million aquarium Washington's ghetto kids can't live without.

Finally, the bill was rewritten to include the three phrases I mentioned earlier, to place a limit on the number of colleges that could be eligible.

Altogether the four eligibility criteria of Title III make a lot of sense and, seriously, I think Congress is to be congratulated for shaping up this realistic and trail-blazing legislation. Their definition of a developing institution, while somewhat limited is quite defensible, educationally and politically.

As quoted in a recent newsletter from the AAJC program, John Gardner reminded us that morale is an essential ingredient in any successful college improvement program. This would apply to the Title III junior colleges and to others associated with this project. Board members and administrators who have had even a little experience on the job will quickly add that money is also important. Some might even take the view that money may not be the most important thing, but it's far ahead of what's second.

Whether we consider improving morale, raising money, designing curriculum or building faculty effectiveness, improvement has to begin with a <u>desire</u> to change, to seek a better way of doing what we are obligated to do as educators. Hopefully, this initial urge will spark additional thoughts and larger desires and in time lead to total appraisal and complete overhaul, possibly to the ultimate revolutionary questions about yesterday's warmed-over curriculums and their relevance for today's students. The important thing is to start. As the Chinese saying goes, "A journey even of one thousand miles begins with one step."

How to initiate self-evaluation that leads to new action is at the heart of this conference and the entire project. Beginning with a wish to improve the quality and substance of education, you as administrators and board members, aided and abetted by consultants, will have available many opportunities for reflection, for pooling efforts and planning action.

It is important to keep in mind that these efforts have been designed to supplement and not supplant whatever else would normally be attempted to improve the condition of your colleges. What will be done through this project may touch only the surface of your discontent. If deeper, more lasting effects can be achieved, so much the better.

In a final analysis, scheduled for next March at the AAJC convention in Atlanta, we will have a chance to gauge what a year's efforts have contributed to the continuing process of directed study and change.

When we look back from the vantage point of the Atlanta meeting and review the chain of events beginning here, I'm hopeful we will detect significant changes brought about in each of the colleges because of all your energetic efforts. If any changes are to take place, you have the responsibility to start setting the stage for action now and to encourage, train and cajole all the actors to give their best performance during the coming months.

This is the role of leadership. Undoubtedly, you already have underway programs of change and improvement on your campuses but we do hope this project gives you further incentive and specific assistance in going beyond what you might have accomplished without it.

Using dictionary terms, this project should help you to make something that was latent active -- to make actually available or usable something previously only potentially available or usable. To help your colleges through a process of growth or evolution by successive changes from a less perfect to a more perfect or more highly organized state. To advance from a simpler form or state of existence to one more complex either in structure or function.

Between now and next March at Atlanta, each college represented here will have made deliberate efforts to cause more and better attitudinal and behavioral changes in all students:

a) more efficiently to get bigger desired changes with the usual or smaller input.

b) more effectively to cause deeper changes with more relevance to students' lives and to the modern world.

c) more imaginatively to bring about changes in student behavior and attitudes formerly untried or overlooked, yes, even unorthodox, methods and programming; and also causing positive changes in behavior and attitudes regarding such things as relations, citizen action and relations between trustee, administration, faculty and students.

All this is the ultimate responsibility of your leadership. You have no one to whom you can pass the buck.

Without some concentration of effort it's possible for this project to cause a real ferment in junior college education, and subsequently in all education. There are excellent opportunities to develop the linkages Paul Miller recommended between all segments of education. It will be even more important in the future than in the past to tap the resources of the university, to pull it into the central areas of junior college education. Many university research centers are already contributing to this field, but we should look to them for even more assistance and involvement.

(Eighteen ERIC centers are now available as information repositories.)

In addition, professional agencies and research units are studying and compiling data on such things as the diffusion of innovations and the translation of research findings into actual patterns of practice.

One model, for example, comes from the field of medicine whose researchers are analyzing the development of communication links between medical researchers and the practitioners. They find, logically, that the practioners accept the findings of research and modify their practices only after certain conditions exist and certain procedures are followed.

First, the practitioners have to be made aware of the research findings; then they must develop an interest in modifying their work; next, an evaluation of the process followed--a peeking in to see if things were really working as they should; and then finally the full adoption of the practices recommended on the basis of the research.

There are many other kinds of models swimming around in various fields, and many still in process of development. Some show the need in certain situations for innovative ideas to germinate for a while in the protective care of a small sympathetic group. (A protective environment until the appropriate time for the implementation of the idea.)

There are also models useful in analyzing the process of orienting teachers to new institutional research in junior colleges.

Many of our colleges need to establish a systems approach to seeking change--determining when change is desirable--setting administration or organization machinery to effect change.

We need to encourage the development of a sense of urgency about the need to improve our institutional methods, classroom techniques, etc.

This project originally aimed at developing areas of:

1. administration and finance
2. curriculum and staff
3. student personnel services

But it has been broadened to cover other areas of direct interest and concern to the colleges. So the project is flexible, yet like a river with some independent cross-currents, it should flow in a general direction toward the establishment of self-improvement programs in critical areas of college operation.

Perhaps in your sessions with consultants you'll begin discussion of some of the approaches that might be considered. If all these consultants, conferences and consortiums needle or cajole or entice or stimulate you to reach for higher goals, the project will have been worth the efforts.

When you actually reach pay dirt we hope you'll share the news with us so that Selden Menefee and Shaf Nader can ring it up in their cash register. If you have to pass any bucks to us, please make them green.

We think the USOE staff has been very wise and perceptive in placing its bets on this group of colleges. I'm confident that when next March rolls around we will have available to all who can read the situation 85 excellent working definitions of "a truly developing college."

(16)

FEDERAL PROGRAMS FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES

Dr. John P. Mallan, AAJC Director of Government Relations, said that developing junior colleges, like other junior colleges, are eligible for a variety of Federal aid programs. They should be sure that they are taking full advantage of these programs, which include:

1. Student scholarships, grants, and work-study funds;
2. College library aid;
3. Vocational education funds (for many colleges, depending on state policy);
4. Facilities assistance, although this is now limited for budgetary reasons; and
5. Nursing education support.

There are many other programs of less general nature which may provide help to junior colleges.

Mallan emphasized that there is a growing interest in helping colleges which serve disadvantaged students, both rural and urban, in all parts of the country. A number of developing colleges meet this criterion. Programs which may help such colleges include:

1. The Education Professions Development Act, EPDA, which places special emphasis on the training and retraining of teachers to work with the disadvantaged and also at developing junior colleges;
2. The Appalachian education programs, which provide assistance to colleges in a large area stretching from western New York State through Alabama;
3. Anti-poverty programs, including Head Start, New Careers, and so on. OEO (Office of Economic Opportunity), the anti-poverty agency, is showing an increasing interest in the junior college. Dr. Dorothy Knoell of AAJC is working with such programs in junior colleges and can supply information.

The Program With Developing Institutions is a breakthrough in that it is not limited to a narrow area such as facilities or particular functions, but involves planning for general improvement, of instruction and in many other areas.

Mallan suggested strongly that developing junior colleges get to know their Congressmen and Senators, and let them know their colleges' special strengths and needs. Many developing junior colleges are located in states and districts represented by senior members of some of the most important Congressional committees.

FACILITIES INFORMATION SERVICE

Robert B. Malcolm, Director of the AAJC Facilities Information Service, said he stood ready to advise colleges with problems involving facilities planning, but this function of AAJC "is a two-way street ... you must share your information with us so that others may benefit from your experience as you expect to benefit from theirs."

"Planning is a continuous activity," he said, "involving many dimensions: Money, facilities, students, community. The planning process for an existing institution is substantially the same as that for a new institution except that it has an added dimension - existing conditions that must be analyzed.

"Replanning is a recognized tool that the existing college should avail itself of," said Malcolm.

He added, "We expect change and growth in the student through the process of education. These same qualities are identifiable in a vital institution. The purpose of information is to identify the options. Change is possible when enough people know all the options. Sound planning considers change and growth and devises strategies to accommodate them."

"Just as the concepts of planning are becoming well established and recognized," he concluded, "we find that the rulesof the game have changed." There is a need to expand the dimensions that circumscribe our individual approaches to planning and to expand the planning team. "Community planning" was cited as a new concern to be added to the categories of educational and campus planning and "socio-physical planning" as a concept related to concern with the needs of the student.

OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION PROJECT

Gilbert Saunders of the AAJC Occupational Education Project said his project has several functions: building an occupational inventory; intensive programs in such specialized areas as health, engineering, and safety-related programs; holding regional workshops; identifying and training consultants; and consulting with colleges on particular problems.

Mr. Saunders stressed that a good occupational program must: (1) provide marketable entrance-level skills, (2) give the student what he needs to grow on the job, and (3) provide general education for citizenship.

New techniques are being tried out in many colleges, such as mobile classrooms to bring occupational education to the people where they work and live.

FACULTY AND MANPOWER CONSIDERATIONS FOR DEVELOPING COLLEGES

Derek S. Singer
Director, AAJC Faculty Development Project

(Excerpts from a speech at the AAJC Conference on Planning for Development, Airlie House, Warrenton, Virginia, June 14, 1968)

I. The Institutional Background and the Student

I would like to begin my remarks on faculty and manpower considerations for developing colleges by a brief reference to some of the basic statistics in Dr. K. Patricia Cross' new book.* These figures will provide us with some perspective on the numbers and the nature of the instructors we most need:

1. Nearly 1/3 of new junior college students are 19 or older - counting part-timers.

2. New junior college students are coming to us increasingly from the 2nd, 3rd and lowest quartiles of high schools.

3. Only 40% of junior college students come from homes with family incomes over $10,000 p.a. (vs. 64% of students in private universities).

4. Only 16% of junior college students' fathers were in professional or managerial occupations (vs. 49% of the fathers of senior college students).

5. 46% of junior college students cite low costs as a major consideration in the choice of a college (vs. only 35% of senior college students).

6. 63% of junior college students work while attending college. (Between 1/4 and 1/3 of senior college students work.)

7. One quarter of the transfer students from junior colleges now at senior institutions were originally uncertain about their major fields. One third of them said they originally felt unprepared for senior college work and had to "make sure" about themselves.

8. Only 37% of junior college students rate themselves "above average" in academic ability. (61% of four year college students, and 69% of university students, so rate themselves.)

9. Only 47% of junior college students feel they have a strong "drive to achieve" (vs. 59% at four year colleges and 63% at universities).

10. Concerning their self-concept of "above average leadership ability," the figures are 29%, 39% and 49%, respectively.

* The Junior College Student: A Research Description, K. Patricia Cross, Ph.D., Educational Testing Service, 1968.

11. In intellectual self-confidence, only 27% of our students rate themselves high, compared to 36% and 43% of those in four year colleges and universities respectively.

12. On writing ability, the percentages stand at 19%, vs. 29% and 32%; and on "above average" self-ratings in mathematical ability, the figures are 24%, 36% and 44%.

13. Junior college students are generally more conventional than students at other colleges. They are also less independent, less attracted to reflective thought, less tolerant of peers, more cautious, prudent, controlled, and more apprehensive and rigid over grades and academic standing (Medsker, pp. 32-33).

14. 71% of our junior college students agree with the statement: "The main reason for continuing your education beyond high school is to prepare for a job that pays well," and 62% of our students said they wanted "job-related courses" in college.

15. While most junior college transfer students say they are happy with their first two years at junior colleges, students in vocational and occupational curricula at junior colleges are substantially more dissatisfied.

16. Despite vocational uncertainties and career goal changes among junior college students, over 1/2 of those who transfer have in fact majored in an applied field - the majority in education, business and engineering (49%).

17. 51% of junior college students would have changed completely or substantially their high school courses "if they had it all to do over". Only 28% of four year college students felt the same way.

18. Over 67% of senior college students had a definite career aim by their senior year in high school. Only 49% of junior college students had decided by then on a career.

19. 68% of junior college students want help to develop good study techniques; 64% want help with education and vocation plans; and 54% said they need assistance with increased reading speed and understanding.

20. About 1/3 of junior college students come from managerial and professional homes, but about 2/3 of our freshmen aspire to jobs at these levels.

QUOTE 1

Summary of her data by the author:

"The junior college is ... a place where all high school students have the opportunity to explore possible careers and find the type of education appropriate to their individual ability; in short, as a place where everyone is admitted and everyone succeeds. Its 'soft response' is to let down hopes gently and unexplosively. Through it, students who are failing or barely passing find their occupational and academic future being redefined. Many who aspire to the managerial and professional occupations will gradually find their niche in the skilled and semi-professional occupations instead. In operational terms, it means moving students out of transfer majors into terminal programs of vocational, business or semi-professional training."

Clearly, such challenges as these require an adequate, continuous supply of top-notch teachers - teachers who can accept enthusiastically and pitch in wholeheartedly to work with, and for, the young and not-so-young students at our colleges with such backgrounds, abilities and aspirations. Teachers are needed who believe in the junior college movement, and who seek to make a career in higher education - or at least to devote several years to our open door, career-oriented, learning-directed institutions. How many do we need, and how are we doing in attracting our new teachers?

II. Other Problems A. Recruitment

There are now 75,000 teachers. With 1200 junior colleges by 1975 and 3,000,000 students, there will be: 100,00 new faculty - FT; 100,000 new faculty - PT needed over the next decade (per study by Thomas B. Merson, Preparation of Junior College Instructors (Part II), AAJC, 1963).

Technological fields will have the most acute shortages. Also: community service people, adult education people, administrative people, urbanologists, and special new career fields people - will all be in short supply.

Approaches toward improving recruitment: Work with college and university counselors and placement offices, professional and AAJC classified ads, state and National Education Association lists, new computerized manpower services. Since new services such as the last named appear to hold out a great promise for future recruiting of substantial quantities of needed teaching and administrative staff, I will read a brief description on how one of these programs works:

"How Matches are Made:

1. The member institution opens a professional search by submitting, on special forms provided by ECS (Educational Career Service), a description of the position to be filled.

2. ECS searches the personnel bank for individual candidates whose credentials meet or exceed minimum job specifications. This source of qualified candidates is often supplemented by discreet direct inquiry to other sources of qualified candidates.

3. The position description is sent to each qualified candidate who may excercise his right to decline to be considered. In this event, the candidate's identity is never revealed thus insuring complete anonymity.

4. A candidate who wishes to be considered files with ECS a statement setting forth the reasons for his interest and his specific qualifications for the opportunity under consideration. This gives ECS the right to release the candidate's identity to the employing institution.

5. ECS personnel consultants review the credentials of each interested candidate and submit to the employing institution profiles of those who appear to be best qualified. The institution is then free to contact the candidate directly.

6. ECS strives to submit three candidates during each professional search. However, institutions by special arrangement may request from ECS the credentials of all candidates who have expressed an interest in the position.

7. Searches remain open until the employing institution notifies ECS that the position has been filled or instructs ECS to terminate the search. As an added service ECS, sixty days after the search is opened, will send a reminder to the institutional member asking if the search should remain open for an additional thirty-day period. Additional reminders are sent at thirty-day intervals thereafter. To insure continuity ECS never closes a specific search without specific instructions from the employing institution.

8. ECS is a non-profit membership organization. There is never any placement fee paid by institutions or by individual members for completed matches."

Let us now turn to an examination of some of the other pertinent questions which should be asked about faculty arrangements at our developing institutions. Answers will not prove easily available for all of them on each campus, but if asking them provokes some thought and self-examination, seeking their answers may well stimulate positive action and improvements at least on some of the campuses.

B. Other Major Faculty Questions to Explore

1. What are the fringe benefits, especially sabbatical policy, now available to the faculty?

2. What is the tenure policy of the college for faculty?

3. Is there a voice by which the faculty can be heard via campus teacher organizations, clubs or groups?

4. Is there close coordination between the student counseling staff and the faculty?

5. What is the faculty turnover rate on an annual basis? Is it particularly serious for certain disciplines or in certain areas? If so, why?

6. What are the in-service training and self-improvement opportunities available for the faculty?

7. Is there an organized faculty and staff orientation program for new instructors?

8. Is there a balance or an enriching "mix" of faculty with varied educational, geographical, age, sex, social, economic and employment backgrounds?

9. How are faculty members evaluated and rated? Is there a promotion system based in part on merit and excellence of performance?

10. Is the faculty assisting in administration and curriculum planning? If not, why not?

11. What are the criteria followed for setting an equitable, uniform salary schedule for faculty?

12. Is the fairest and most productive way to assign faculty load - both teaching and non-teaching - being observed?

13. Is there a maximum, or an average, teacher:student ratio set? If not, what should be its limits and nature?

14. Are faculty in divisions and departments efficiently structured and coordinated among themselves, and among different departments?

III. Some Propositions and Issues to Consider in Seeking Answers to these Questions

- Staff development is directly related to staff quality, administrative leadership, and adequate budgetary provisions;

- Institutions must consciously plan long-term staff development programs and monitor their implementation;

- Quality training, not just conferences or workshops is needed. Such training must be carefully related to institutional goals, staff responsibilities and opportunities for professional growth at each college;

- Our institutions can, through training, orientation and better administrative procedures, develop more effective ways of heading-off faculty friction, disagreements, and even staff alienation and ultra-militant activities on some campuses.

IV. EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF FUTURE FACULTY MEMBERS

Finally, we will turn to a brief examination of what is, perhaps, the central question which underlies the whole issue of faculty development for our colleges. This is, the matter of who shall train our new generations of teachers, and how will their education be accomplished?

Relatively little has been written in this area, as compared with other questions in our field, but this is changing. Interest in this vital educational matter is on the upsurge. More meetings are being called, more papers written, more questions are being asked on whether present arrangements, including traditional degrees, for preparing our teachers are still sound and adequate today. The issue is one in which our developing institutions have a particularly important stake, for true junior college development and teacher excellence must go hand in hand.

Logically, the first problem to look at in examining the teacher training issue is to assess whether or not the universities - our "wholesale suppliers" or "jobbers" - have been doing an adequate job in recent years of preparing new teachers for us, their community college "retail clients."

In a recent paper on "Some Special Problems of Junior College Faculty Development," AAJC's John Mallan has answered the question generally in the negative. He wrote on the Lack of Graduate School Understanding, and said:

"Traditionally, many graduate school and university faculty members have been unaware of or uninterested in the special problems of junior college faculty development. Many university educators have been frankly skeptical of or hostile to the junior college; some have engaged in efforts to discourage the development of junior colleges in their states. One reason for this skepticism or hostility is the tendency of university faculty and administrators to judge any institution of higher education in terms of traditional university standards or would-be standards. The university emphasis on the traditional academic disciplines, on research, scholarship, and publication, on "reputationalism," on the values associated with the Ph.D. and the Ph.D. process, have influenced attitudes toward junior colleges and toward many less well-known colleges and universities. ...

"What are usually considered the most outstanding or prestigious universities place greatest emphasis on the development of nationally and internationally outstanding scholars and research workers in the major traditional academic disciplines. A good many other universities and graduate schools have tried in varying degrees to emulate the outstanding institutions, sometimes seeming to place more emphasis on the number of Ph.D.'s on the faculty or the number of published articles annually than on the actual quality of either Ph.D.'s or published research. The most outstanding or prestigious universities have also tended to hold to the belief that training in the discipline and in research is adequate preparation for undergraduate teaching. Many of those in the disciplines frown on schools of education and on courses in educational method or techniques, one result being that a good many college and university professors are unacquainted with the history of American higher education, the variety and diversity of American colleges, and the problems and needs which face most of these institutions. The dichotomy between liberal arts colleges and schools of education has further discouraged attention to the junior college, because most of the few university teachers actively interested in the junior college are in schools of education.

"It is still uncommon at most universities for prospective junior college teachers to take a course in education, in the junior college, or in problems of college teaching. Internships in junior college education, or serious attempts to interest graduate students in junior college teaching as a career, are also relatively uncommon, with a few notable exceptions.

"Even more uncommon are special programs, whether summer institutes or in-service training programs, related to the problems of junior college teaching, post-secondary vocational fields, adult education, and certainly to the education of the disadvantaged.

"While most graduate schools state that they offer programs to prepare junior college teachers, many of these programs at least until very recently have consisted of the usual academic program, with the apparent assumption that a prospective teacher will simply complete many of the usual requirements of the Ph.D. up to the dissertation or final doctoral examinations.

"In many states, junior college educators seem to feel that they have little or no contact with their colleagues at the universities, even those in the same discipline. Roger Garrison's study of junior college faculty showed that many

teachers do not have the funds or time to attend the national professional meetings in their field, and that they often feel that such meetings give little attention to junior college or undergraduate teaching problems.

"All of this greatly complicates the development of relevant and professionally sound junior college fellowship and institute proposals, with some EPDA support, in the years immediately ahead. In many parts of the country it may be necessary to create de novo, to establish teacher education programs which have never existed before and to bring together university educators, junior college leaders, and sometimes state officials who never have worked together and who know little of each other's needs and priorities. To put it another way, most junior college educators would feel it highly undesirable if graduate faculties alone develop EPDA proposals in the junior college field, without the close involvement of junior college specialists both in planning and implementation. This is especially true in the vocational fields and in the education of the disadvantaged."

Probably most of us here would agree with John's analysis and critique. But next we must ask: "What are some possible alternatives to the present university training programs which should be considered?"

1. Retain the university-controlled teacher preparation courses. Liberalize them by stressing on-the-job junior college training and closer cooperation through other measures with our two-year institutions.

2. Develop more or less permanent consortia of universities and junior colleges, with representatives from each who would jointly administer and teach in new teacher training institutions, designed to supply our schools with better-prepared career teachers.

3. Plan for a pilot community college institute(s) or academy(s), through which representative two-year colleges could plan, direct and run their own teacher training programs in the future. There is a new AAJC guide now under preparation, summarizing existing teacher training programs we now know about.

However it is structured, what are the emphases needed in any really first-rate program for preparing tomorrow's junior college teachers? I believe that the leaders in our field today would probably place greatest stress on the following elements in a program of optimum teacher training:

1. Comprehending what the role of a community college is and should be.

2. Understanding and applying modern learning theory.

3. Defining goals for curriculum development.

4. Imparting basic elements of student guidance and counseling to all new teachers.

5. Gaining knowledge and practice in school administration, so as to ease the transition of faculty to administrators; make campus communication easier; and prepare teachers to better plan and direct their own groups and associations on campus.

6. Examining, in depth, the goals, culture, values and psychology of the student population of today's junior colleges.

7. Providing the opportunity for substantial, relevant, supervised practice teaching.

8. Creating an ability and a "feel" for translating (and utilizing) curriculum in programmed instructional format.

9. Imparting a knowledge and an appreciation for the effective use of modern media and educational hardware as one tool for better teaching.

10. Preparing teachers to define specific goals for teaching students in such a way so as to clearly attain measurable instructional objectives in every course and lesson they prepare and present.

11. Informing and motivating student teachers on available resources for defining and perceiving the socio-economic situation and needs of the community or neighborhood in which the school is located. Relating such knowledge to teaching objectives and counseling procedures.

12. Providing a double or even a triple "major" and/or strong "minors," while concurrently teaching our teachers how to develop a plan on teaching their subject(s) on an interdisciplinary basis, to students of widely varying abilities and interests. Fields where the inter-disciplinary approach seems to show most promise of successful curriculum adoption, particularly in bridging the artificial transfer-terminal dichotomy in our colleges, might include:

Ecology: Comprising biology and geology
General Science: physics, chemistry and biology
American Civilization: history, literature, political science and civics
Western or World Civilization: English, history, social studies, and government.

AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY

(Panel Discussions, Airlie House, June 14, 1968)

1. THE ROLE OF THE TRUSTEE

Chairman: John Dunn, Superintendent, Peralta J.C. District, Oakland, California
Panel: Stanley Van Lare, Fred Wellman, John Hudnall

The panel had indicated the dangers inherent in attempting to describe the general principles of board-administration relationships; several principles were enumerated and discussed:

1) The board of a public agency should be a board of review but not a rubber stamp ... Policy making, not administration, is the main function of the Board.

2) Public agency boards should operate as committees of the whole. Standing committees should not be established; ad hoc committees can be established to meet certain specific problems. Boards of private colleges which meet less often may need to depend on standing committees in order to fulfill certain specific functions such as the development of financial resources for the college.

3) The board should insist that a written manual of by-laws and procedures be developed, widely disseminated among the members of the college community, and implemented.

4) A board member is a key person in the chain of communication between the community and the college, and the college and the community.

5) Board members should do their homework in preparation for all meetings.

It was recommended that the AAJC should set up conferences of board members.

***

2. THE ROLE OF THE PRESIDENT

Chairman: Clifford Erickson, President, Rock Valley College, Rockford, Illinois
Panel: James Wattenbarger, Frederic Giles, Robert Zimmer

The rather unusual situation of having three consultants, "somewhat uninvited," to visit and offer to assist the college, was discussed by Dr. Wattenbarger. He followed this brief comment by urging the presidents to send to the consultants in advance questions that they need help in answering. For background information it was requested that the President furnish the consultants with statements of purposes and goals, catalogues, and any recent studies of the college, if he has not already done so.

Dr. Giles stated the importance of knowing where you are and where you want to go. "The consultants can help you with the road map - assign priorities on goals. Do you want the scenic route or the fast direct way? The more precise your questions and the statement of your goals are, the better use you can make of the consultants. They are perfectly willing to socialize, but that would be a misuse of your time and their talents."

Questions were raised about using different consultants for the second visit if the problems warranted. (This will be done.)

The reports to the presidents will be for their assistance in developing their institutions. These are not accreditation reports.

The presidents revealed a deep sense of commitment and said this will be a rare opportunity to use this project for the development of their colleges.

***

3. THE CONSULTANTS' RESPONSIBILITY

Chairman: Jane Matson, Director, Student Personnel Project, AAJC
Panel: Donald Deyo, Isaac Beckes, Thomas Diener, Selden Menefee

1) Difficulties for the consultants in AAJC Program with Developing Institutions - Problem: getting acquainted. a. The colleges, generally, have not asked specifically for the consultants scheduled to visit them; b. Members of each consultant team may be strangers to one another; c. Colleges are likely to be somewhat defensive - feeling they are already doing a good job.

2) Consultants may play one or more roles - teacher, resource person, administrator.

3) Work of the consultant includes: a. Learning as much as possible about the college and his team prior to site visitation; b. Helping the college to identify its needs; c. Helping the college to establish priorities among those needs; d. Helping the college to determine ways and means to tackle these problems.

4) Cautions for Consultants: a. Consultants are not expected to work with colleges primarily for the development of Title III (HEA) proposals. This may be a by-product of the process; b. Consultants should not have expectations that a 3-day summer visit will result in a complete transformation of the institution within two or three months; c. Consultant team reports are to be released to no one but to AAJC and the college president; d. Teams should be aware that, although they may, in good faith, be critical of certain policies or procedures, they are not to consider themselves as "accrediting" or "standards-setting" agents per se; they, rather, are there to assist the college in developing more effective planning.

SPECIALIZED WORKSHOPS: SUMMARIES

1. ADMINISTRATION: Community Colleges

Chairman: Edward Redford; Recorder: Donald Fink; Panelists: Eric Bradner, Donald Deyo, Harold Shively

This workshop operated as a problems session.

Problem 1: The administrative problem of integrating the technical/vocational activities into the total college operation. Too frequently the division of transfer vs. technical leads to second class citizenship and the organizational pattern reinforces the situation; adult or continuing education is often subject to the same attitudes.

One college organized its total instructional activity into five divisions, with both academic and occupational programs in each. But by integrating the occupational activities, vocational instructors are adopting academic instructors' views on faculty load, making these expensive programs even more so.

Problem 2: Faculty militancy - some observations: If faculty is involved in expenditure planning and policy setting, at least a portion of them are conscientious and come to take a broader point of view. Individualized instruction, automated teaching and audio-tutorial teaching will probably provide a solution to the faculty load restrictions being imposed by negotiators. Militancy may eventually cause supporting communities to become "fed up." One result could well be statewide salary schedules. The disenchanted community is made up of many other militants who have benefitted from 30 years of collective negotiations in the private sector; teacher militancy is a reaction. As faculties become militant, we as colleagues must maintain professional respect for them as fellow educators.

Faculty members desire to be heard by direct contact with the board. Dr. Isaac Beckes said that in years of consultations:

a. If faculty leaders are involved directly in decision-making and administration, there is little militancy of an unreasonable type; and

b. If faculty leaders merely give advice, militancy arises.

One college brings the board and faculty together each 18 mos. in an informal session.

Problem 3: Student militancy - some observations: Students want policy determination status. There is a legal question of who shall run the institution. Administrative staff members should develop a plan of action in case of student take-overs or demonstrations. An announced procedure should exist for hearing complaints.

An AAJC survey showed that less than half of the colleges contacted had clearly stated procedures. Administrators must be more visible among students, especially the president.

General Comments:

There is probably no reliable research on the proper limitation of the size of a community college. This generation of students and faculty members is a concerned one, and we must review the relevancy of the curriculum. We should preserve the American system as opposed to the European university concept. Colleges and universities governed by layman boards are among the finest institutions in our contemporary society.

2. ADMINISTRATION: Private Colleges

Chairman: W. Burkette Raper; Recorder: Sister Muriel Hogan;
Panelists: Isaac Beckes, A.W. Baisler, James Hall

Dr. Raper opened the meeting by expressing some positions in regard to higher education and the private junior colleges, in particular:

1) Education is notably affected by: finance, students, faculty and the community. All of these are related to administration.

2) In junior college history the beginnings were made in private institutions; today the proportion in enrollment between private and public junior colleges is reversed: 10% private, 90% public enrollment.

3) The private junior college has three distinct advantages: a. Because of smaller student bodies, it can help the student find his personal identity. The present day student wants to be listened to and shows this through demonstrations, rebellion and strikes. This can also apply to the faculty. b. Most private junior colleges are church-related. They are attempting to give students a Christian dimension not given by the public institutions. However, are the poor and disadvantaged really served by the church-related junior college? c. The private junior colleges have more opportunities to innovate, experiment and adjust to change. They are not as closely controlled by boards and legislation.

Some of the major reactions to Dr. Raper's presentation were:

1) The private college has not always challenged itself to innovate, but has followed tradition. The community college has been more innovative. More cooperation (consortia) would improve this condition.

2) Because of fear of articulation in transfer, private colleges have too often let their curriculum be dictated by senior colleges.

3) Should the private college be more oriented to community needs? One reaction was that such programs were too expensive. Dr. Beckes stated that some were not, and that terminal courses could well be introduced by the private junior college. Often the lower half of the high school class is not being reached.

4) The value of smallness in size was challenged. The large institution seeks to overcome its problems in this area by employment of more counselors, regulation of class size, and improved student services.

5) Some alarm was expressed concerning the establishment of community colleges so near private colleges that they would compete for students. It was suggested that the private college emphasize its special function and better define its objectives. It should not attempt to do everything the community college does.

Comments:

The workshop session seemed to center on the strengths of the private junior colleges and the weaknesses that follow when the strengths are not implemented into each institution's objectives.

3. ADMINISTRATION: Financial Aid

Chairman: Isaac Beckes; Recorder: Thomas Diener; Panelist: Lee Henderson

1) Areas of need (both public and private colleges):

Scholarships
Lectureships
Program development (curriculum)
Faculty development
Equipment/buildings

2) Sources of funds:

Business/industry
Foundations
Civic organizations
Community groups
Individuals

3) Long range planning of financial support is a necessary part of each institution's strategy.

4) Attitudes of the trustees and the president are of the utmost importance in fund raising.

5) Beware of gifts with strings attached to them.

6) Gifts to the college should be recognized and accepted by the Board of Trustees.

7) Sources of private assistance include: (1) American Association of Fund-Raising Counsels; (2) Foundation-Library Center, New York City; (3) Foundation Directory; and (4) Council for Financial Aid to Education.

8) What impact is student unrest having on giving and the general financial support of colleges? This question was raised but remained largely unanswered in the subsequent discussion.

4. FACULTY MANPOWER AND RESOURCES

Chairman: Derek Singer; Recorder: M. Frances Kelly; Panelists: W. E. Combs
Wilson Wetzler

Opening Statement by Chairman Derek Singer, Director of AAJC Faculty Development Project:

I. INTRODUCTION

In this workshop on faculty development, I believe we can best begin by pointing toward certain key factors which consultants might look for and review during your visits to college campuses.

For organizational purposes only, I have divided the structure of our review into two main headings: 1. Faculty Activities and Involvement, and 2. Staff Selection, Employment, and Organization Policies of the College.
In doing this, I have tried to follow roughly the organization of B. Lamar Johnson's excellent treatment of our subject contained in his book, "Starting a Community Junior College."

II. A REVIEW OF FACULTY ACTIVITIES AND INVOLVEMENT

Is the faculty involved in, and does it have time and opportunity clearly available to keep up with and to express concern, opinions and advice, regarding:

1. Goals, plans and purposes of the college?
2. Promotion of its own professional welfare and personal self-interests through clubs, senates, associations, groups, etc.?
3. Selection, planning, utilization, revision and evaluation of curriculum, including texts and other standard teaching materials?
4. Advising administrators on policy and administration of the college?
5. Nature, utilization, policies and development of the library?
6. Use and benefits of new media - radio, TV, films, filmstrips, slides, cassettes, tapes, language labs, CAI, and other programmed instructional materials and techniques?
   (NOTE: Are these techniques and resources clearly understood, and is it widely known and shown just how they can be coordinated with the instructional goals of the school and of the course?)
7. Adult, extension and community education, cultural and service programs of the college?
8. Evaluation of instruction to include such things as:
- Testing Programs
- Findings of follow-up studies of both transfer and terminal students
- Findings of drop-out studies
- Classroom visitations and intervisitations
- Use of tape recordings of class periods, including visuals (kinescope or film) wherever possible
- Studies and observations on student use of the library
- Student opinions
- Analysis of instructional materials developed for each course
9. Admission, retention, probation, graduation and follow-up standards and policies for students?

10. Advising and counseling students to select and program their courses? (NOTE: Is faculty so involved selected with care; given in-service education by professional counselors; opportunity and encouragement for special summer study; and competent supervision and direction?)

11. The nature and operations of a student placement program or employment service, so as to re-enforce the college's key role in job preparation?

III. A REVIEW OF STAFF SELECTION, EMPLOYMENT AND ORGANIZATION POLICIES OF THE COLLEGE

1. Is there a fair and reasonable balance between staff member backgrounds - high school (local and other four year colleges or universities; new graduates; business and industry (active or retired); retired military or civil service; housewives and other trained "part-timers"; other two-year colleges; or elsewhere?
2. Are there any problems with nepotism or family favoritism?
3. Is there either a "looseleaf" faculty handbook or a recent published one? If not, why not?
4. Is there a satisfactory resolution of the issue of divisional vs. departmental vs. college-wide working organization on the campus? (NOTE: Divisional organization has been found to be preferable most often)
5. Are staff planning and orientation conferences regularly scheduled and held each summer, one week to one month in duration?
6. In this connection, is adequate time and opportunity allocated for individual instructors and faculty groups to prepare their own work and teaching?
7. Are general policies regarding salary, attendance at meetings, fringe benefits, work load and other basic employment conditions clear, unequivocal and fairly applied? Are they freely discussed, evaluated and re-examined in light of new experience and conditions?
8. Is there a merit salary schedule in effect, based on quality of work?
9. Has consideration been given by all concerned to a faculty rank system?
10. Concerning recruitment, is adequate information about the college and the jobs open disseminated broadly through all channels available - i.e., professional journals, AAJC, teacher placement agencies and offices, classified ads (cf. New York Times), and the new computerized services (eg. EGS)
11. Is there a representative faculty committee structure whose meetings are particularly concerned with interesting and relevant matters such as curriculum and instruction, and student personnel services?
12. Is there a policy review group or other established effective channel (eg., a newsletter) to inform faculty and to solicit faculty reaction and opinion to college policies and procedures?
13. Does the college sponsor or effectively encourage faculty socials, recreational groups, family affairs and other morale-building events to foster a positive and constructive atmosphere?
14. Is there an adequate schedule of interesting and attractive speakers and consultants for the college, prepared to deal with topics of direct concern to the faculty?
15. Is instructional supervision regularized, accepted and handled with tact, efficiency and good judgment? Do individual faculty members or departments have a voice in the process?

16. Where available on campus or nearby, are faculty members permitted and encouraged to take in-service training?
17. Are instructors encouraged to utilize facilities and to develop problems for institutional research facilities available to the college or the district?

ESTABLISHING CONDITIONS OF EMPLOYMENT*

1. Problem: Developing a job description for each staff position.
   Suggestions: Secure job descriptions developed at other junior colleges or by state departments of education for use as a guide.
   Formulate initial job descriptions prior to appointment of staff members.
   Assign each staff member continuing responsibility for studying and recommending changes in his job description.
2. Problem: Developing policies regarding teacher load.
   Suggestions: Study teaching load policies in other junior colleges. In formulating policies, recognize such varying conditions as class size, laboratory hours, number of different preparations, and load in reading and correcting papers, particularly in courses such as English composition.
3. Problem: Limiting the need for faculty to assume extensive clerical and routine duties.
   Suggestions: Reduce faculty duties of clerical nature to minimum. Consider providing readers and/or laboratory assistants for instructors.
   Provide a highly qualified and ample secretarial staff.
   Provide paid student assistants for faculty members.
   Use data processing equipment and other facilities which are helpful in reducing clerical work.
4. Problem: Establishing policies relating to faculty sponsorship of student organizations and other out-of-class activities.
   Suggestions: Study practices of other junior colleges.
   Attempt to identify faculty members genuinely interested in student activities and assign major sponsorship responsibilities to them.
   Relieve these faculty members from other duties such as committee work.
5. Problem: Developing tenure policies.
   Suggestions: Determine and be guided by the provisions of the state's educational law on the subject.
   Study policies at other junior colleges.
6. Problem: Developing policies regarding faculty travel and attendance at professional meetings.
   Suggestions: Study practices followed by other junior colleges.
   In unified districts, for example, make clear to officials and boards of education that policies regarding junior college faculty travel and attendance at professional meetings necessarily differ from those for elementary and high school faculties. In terms of the professional development of staff, recognize the value of such travel and attendance and make generous provision for it.

---

* The next 8 questions are taken directly from Lamar Johnson's Starting Community College."

7. Problem: Establishing fringe benefits for staff members, including health insurance, retirement plan, etc.
   Suggestions: Study practices of other junior colleges and use them as guides.
   Make benefits as generous as feasible, recognizing that generous conditions of employment are valuable in attracting superior staff members to the faculty.
   If possible, introduce a program of sabbatical leaves.
8. Problem: Establishing, particularly in unified districts or in junior colleges under the direction of county boards of supervisors or county superintendents of schools, conditions of employment for junior college staff members which differ, for example, from those of elementary school teachers and civil service employees.
   Suggestions: Make and report studies of practices of other junior colleges to appropriate officials.
   Have junior college consultants explain desirable junior college practices and trends to appropriate officials.
   Arrange for officials to attend meetings of state regional and national junior college associations."

Most of these questions, plus a substantial number of others, can be found in the checklist at the back of B. Lamar Johnson's comprehensive little book on "Starting a Community Junior College," available from the AAJC. Other source material which you may wish to have with you includes:

1. Roger Garrison's "Junior College Faculty: Issues and Problems"
2. Ed Gleazer's "Preparation of Junior College Teachers"
   (Both of the above available from AAJC); and perhaps:
3. The NEA's new and valuable bibliography entitled, "The Junior and Community College Faculty," compiled for the NEA by ERIC, at UCLA.

Discussion

The first point brought up by the group was the issue of faculty tenure. Members of the group related the tenure situation in their state. This revealed a wide diversity of positions, particularly on the part of the private college presidents who have never had a tenure policy.

It was felt that perhaps the relevant question is not whether to grant tenure but how to do it, if we are to accommodate to faculty organization trends across the country. Are we to be caught between the AAUP and collective negotiation? Mr. Singer noted three major organizations attracting faculty: the AAUP, the NEA, and the American Federation of Teachers.

The next question brought up was how to determine the kind of faculty organization most appropriate for the college in question, and how to help it get started.

Mr. Singer replied that what may be needed is a faculty senate "with some teeth and some muscle, that considers relevant questions."

Discussion continued on ways to identify leaders among the faculty and to encourage them to develop faculty organization. Many present showed concern for a lack of professional responsibility on the part of the faculty. Others stated that students are barometers of faculty professionalism.

The next question was faculty rank. Members wondered about the priority of rank and salary. It was the consensus that there are many alternative ways to seek and to express excellence among the faculty. Faculty work in remedial areas, for example, needs encouragement, as does community service.

In conclusion, the observation is that those present -- looking at the broad topic of faculty manpower and resources -- seemed concerned both with challenging faculty and with assisting it to grow and improve.

5. FACULTY ORIENTATION

Chairman: Robert Lahti; Recorder: Wallace Smith; Panelists: Ralph Granneberg, Dale Parnell

1) The following reasons were suggested for having faculty orientation:

Varied background of faculty
To explain the goals of the college
All staff (faculty, administration, secretaries, maintenance) should feel that other staff members are supporting goals
To understand the comprehensive community college
To understand student characteristics
To understand the community and its characteristics
To obtain some common ground of attitudes and values
To understand policies and procedures
To help meet the personal needs of the faculty
To understand the conditions of employment
To create an atmosphere for faculty interaction.

2) Ways to conduct faculty orientation:

a. The administration may conduct program for one, two or three days.
b. Faculty-conducted program (caused considerable controversy: faculty reacts favorably to faculty but administration wants control over faculty selection and program).
c. Use of recent community college graduates in meeting with faculty.
d. Faculty travel to other community colleges to discuss problems with counterparts. (This could be part of a possible proposal for developing community colleges.)
e. Several community colleges meet on a nearby university campus. (Four-year personnel should be invited. They, perhaps, would learn most of all.)
f. In-service training program over a period of several weeks or throughout the year. (This would replace the usual orientation model of a one-shop harangue.)

3) Some special considerations:

a. Old faculty orientation should be included, possibly at the last part of new faculty orientation
Some time should be spent on the learning process.
The characteristics of the students attending the college should be stressed.
b. All the part-time faculty should be included.

4) Two sources of information:

a. Brochure - "Faculty Orientation by a new Community College," by Dr. Robert Lahti, William Rainey Harper College (Palatine, Ill.)
b. Feasibility study,"A Model of Faculty Orientation," by Dr. M. Frances Kelly, New York.

6. CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT: Academic

Chairman: Virginia Keehan; Recorder: Robert Novak; Panelists: Robert Wiegman, John Turano

The following were generally agreed upon:

1) The student is the center of the educational system and therefore must become involved in what he learns.

2) The curriculum must be flexible keeping in mind the following:

   a. Students must have experience in activities in which they can learn about themselves, their environment and how they fit into this environment.

   b. Students need to have the opportunity to experiment outside their field of specialization without the fear of grades.

   c. Students learn at different rates and we must take cognizance of these differences and try to work around the lock-step system so prevalent today.

Finally, other items touched upon were:

1) The importance of the faculty in curriculum development.

2) The importance of the advisory committee in curriculum development.

To end with a question - Does the college have the right to develop a curriculum without fear of the four year institution hovering over it? Our answer was Yes!

7. CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT: Remedial

Chairman: Dr. Johnnie Ruth Clarke; Recorder: Dorothy L. Kearney; Panelists: Edna P. Froehlich, Maxwell King

The chairman, Dr. Johnnie Ruth Clarke, defined remediation as education for those students in junior college who have need of upgrading or repair work in communications and/or computational skills. Junior college people should be aware that many students arrive in need of remedial work, or more particularly in need of compensatory education.

Several approaches may be employed: traditional approaches to basic skills in reading, writing, English, and mathematics; individualized instruction, utilizing some variation of the tutorial system; and a block program of providing for pre-admission to typical junior college programs, such as a basic pattern of courses designed to elevate the students' skills to the 13th grade level.

The most effective approach probably incorporates the principle that the student in need of remedial work needs to see himself first in perspective - where he is, how he got there, and what alternatives are available to him in the existing societal structure. Research suggests that once a student is able to see his possible direction, and is able to make meaningful decisions, he will find realistic and self-determined goals. The fact was underscored that the entering student, asked to make choices before he is aware of the elements of choice, may make unrealistic decisions; however, once he is allowed to know what it takes to achieve his goals, his decisions will be appropriate and realistic for him.

Students need help in improving not only their reading, but their seeing and listening skills as well. To set off reading from the rest of the learning skills is in violation of the principle of how students learn.

Some current programs deal with the identification of students (paid from work study funds) capable of giving tutorial services to students with skill disabilities.

The following questions were raised in the disussion:

1) How does one find faculty to work with the marginal student?
2) What consideration can be given to non-punitive grading, in order to reward success and not penalize failure?
3) How can we recognize the factor of varying time in learning patterns through grading and other practices?
4) What sub-cultural factors operate in the motivation and subsequent performance of students within the college?
5) What innovative practices can be anticipated?

Some tentative answers to the above questions were:

1) Consider seriously in-service training for faculty members who wish to work with these students; provide them with all the technical expertise available to explore the entire learning process.
2) Reinforce the principle of success and alleviate the drop-out problem by effectively instituting non-punitive grading.
3) Allow the student with learning disabilities sufficient time to repair his skills and provide the instructional atmosphere that enhances learning

and allows for variations in learning styles.

4) Recognize that students from the subculture bring to the college varying, but well established, attitudes that militate against learning. Surround the students with "caring" people who are willing to offer help. "Caring" practices should begin with recruitment and pre-registration, continue through counseling and orientation, and be peaked in the classroom.

5) Consider future innovations such as:

Differentiated staffs within the college
Special lecturers
Training of tutors
Training of teacher aides
Developmental workshops
Self-referral laboratories

The workshop closed on the restatement of the conviction that the junior college should remain an "open door," and not continue to be, as some fear, "a revolving door."

8. CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT: Individualized Instruction

Chairman: Patrick Distasio; Recorder: Lee Henderson; Panelists: Donald Fink, Albert Smith

1) There is an increasing concern that the present structuring and scheduling of courses is inappropriate for the wide variety of students served by junior colleges. Each developing junior college in this project has a unique opportunity to begin to plan for individualized instruction. This may result in throwing out existing curriculum, and starting from scratch.

2) Individualized instruction has too often been identified with computers, T.V., learning machines and other hardware. Although such devices when appropriately used can aid in the individualization of instruction, to date the application of these devices has too often been a hindrance to individualization.

3) Any individualization of instruction presupposes the ability to define the desired objective, to provide an appropriate learning situation, and to measure the outcomes. Perhaps the most significant contribution of Oakland Community College has been the determination of behavioral objectives (skills, knowledge, attitudes) of every unit of every course. Once this has been done, the faculty can select appropriate methods and media to achieve these objectives.

4) One danger in the total individualization of instruction is the further dehumanization of the instructional process - the ignoring of the human needs and the developmental aspects of education. However, there are ways of meeting these needs other than through normal pupil-teacher contacts, i.e. encounter groups, group counseling, sensitivity training, etc.

5) One of the best methods of encouraging the individualization of instruction is to permit faculty members to visit other campuses and meet other faculty members using individualized instruction.

6) One of the most pressing needs in this area is for better software. Perhaps significant progress could be made if we had a clearinghouse to report successful development of materials, units, courses, etc.

7) The most important element in individualizing instruction is the attitude and creativity of the faculty. Hardware may be helpful, but it is not essential.

9. OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION

Chairman: Gilbert Saunders, AAJC; Recorder: M. L. Piekarski; Panelists: Alice Thurston, Ben Jones, Ray Perkins

It was suggested that occupational education is a far more descriptive title than vocational or technical education.

1) Junior colleges should be comprehensive to meet the needs of all students. It is useless to talk about an open door unless we have programs on all levels. Otherwise the open door becomes a revolving door.

2) The major problem is the planning of the total program for the student. Who decides the content of technical, vocational and general education courses?

Advisory committees? Professional accrediting associations?

The chairman suggested: 1/3 technical, 1/3 general education, 1/3 support courses. The general problem is the reconciliation of needed technical courses with the needs of the student as a human being.

3) A moment of silence was observed for such items as:

Need for technicians in our society
Need for teachers
What is sacred about one-year, two-year and three-year programs?

4) There was a discussion of having non-degree teachers for purely vocational programs. What is the place of these programs, these students and these teachers in the total college picture?

5) A plea was made that state departments of vocational education be more sensitive to the needs of junior colleges. Colleges should take the lead in discussing these regulations with State Boards. If colleges are not satisfied, protest!

6) All came to life at the mention of funding sources.

Federal-Vocational Education Act
Office of Economic Opportunity
Appalachia Project
Industry, especially foundations
Unusual federal grants to teachers (search out).

10. OCCUPATIONAL PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Chairman: George Mehallis; Recorder: M.L. Piekarski; Panelists: John Greda, Raymond Perkins

The group discussed the administrator's concerns in developing vocational-technical programs in community colleges (see attached list). In addition, a question was posed regarding the organizational pattern for vocational-technical education within a college. If these programs are under the control of the academic dean, technical-vocational dean or major department heads such as business, engineering, etc., it was the consensus of the group that they should be under the control of a technical-vocational dean, with chairmen for each of the programs.

Another question was raised about whether to implement a program for a small number of students or send them to another college. (The case cited involved three small community colleges within a 70-mile radius.) Statewide or regional planning becomes an important factor here, since faculty, funds and facilities are not always available. Student potential is often not sufficient to warrant the same program in all colleges. A suggested plan might be for the student to obtain general education courses at his home campus (Mon.-Wed.-Fri.) and travel to another college for technical courses.

The problem of student attrition in these programs was also cited. A suggestion was made that these students be given a certificate for the number of units completed when they leave the college.

Accreditation of technical programs was also discussed. In one instance where specialized accreditation is not permitted, an advisory committee sought accreditation without using state funds (a professional organization supplying the funds).

The use of advisory committees was advocated in the planning and development of these programs. The committees should be appointed as soon as possible.

The final discussion was in the area of nursing and allied health. The availability of prepared faculty in this area should be considered before any attempts are made to achieve a program. Licensing agencies as well as other professional organizations need to be dealt with in regard to these programs. Adequate funds and facilities need to be available and assured, for a program to be successful.

***

(continued)

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE ADMINISTRATOR'S CONCERNS IN DEVELOPING TECHNICAL-VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS

(a useful check-list)

1) How much does the occupational field offer employment opportunities to those who may be trained?

2) To what extent is the occupation sufficiently stable to warrant expenditure of public funds for a training program?

3) Will a program in this field be unreasonably expensive for the taxpayers to support because of technological changes or early obsolescence of physical facilities?

4) To what extent will community wealth or welfare be increased through the proposed program?

5) Will the training benefits of the proposed program be general in nature and serve a large area of the economy?

6) Are the skills and knowledge required for this occupation sufficient to warrant a junior college level program?

7) Are there any legal conditions which might make the operation of the program difficult?

8) Would the proposed program duplicate existing programs in other junior colleges, area vocational schools or provided by other agencies?

9) What will be the cost of the program, and how will the cost be borne?

10) Will any financial aid be available from sources outside the local school district, such as Federal aid?

11) Can any aid be expected from the industry or occupation concerned? Special equipment? Instructional material? Are qualified potential trainees available or can they be recruited for the proposed type of training?

12) Can the proper physical facilities be provided? Is some type of "work experience" possible?

13) How is the community need for this type of education expressed? By student applications? Waiting lists? By request of management? By request of labor? Parent-teacher groups? Taxpayers' associations? Civic and service organizations? Veterans' groups? By Governmental agencies, such as Civil Service or public employment services?

11. OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION: Business Programs

Chairman: Gilbert Saunders, AAJC; Recorder: Ray Perkins; Panelists: E.B. Moore, Alice Thurston, Jean Page

Some of the things we need to do about business programs are:

1) We have to more carefully delineate the values of business education.

2) We have to communicate to parents, business and industry.

3) We have to look for opportunities where businesses will give special recognition to junior college graduates.

Looking at the larger picture, we need to:

4) Look to consumers of junior college products for more support of all kinds.

5) Utilize advisory committees and other techniques for development of these programs.

6) Minimize confusion about opportunities in occupational careers on the part of students.

***

12. OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION SUMMARY

by Ray Perkins

1) The term "occupational" is generally preferred, since it covers both vocational and technical and avoids "terminal."

2) A need exists to clarify and communicate the occupational story to students, parents, the community and within the institution.

3) Advisory committees need to be utilized more adequately - need to clarify roles.

4) The usual lag of about five years between first recognition of need for program and first graduate is a problem; also whether or not to accredit the school is a problem.

5) Care should be exercised to terminate programs when the need for them no longer exists.

13. INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

Chairman: Dorothy Knoell; Recorder: Jeanette Poore; Panelists: Galen Drewry, Joseph Sutton

Major areas identified in which institutional research projects could profitably be undertaken include:

Enrollment projections
Student performance and prediction studies
Student attrition and drop out
Grading practices
Faculty load
Space utilization
Salaries
Unit costs
Environmental studies
Curriculum (and development) and instruction.

Dr. Sutton schematically presented data elements to be considered in institutional research activities which suggested the interaction that occurs among the elements in an institutional system relating function, structure, and program. His model:

$$(FSP)^2$$

Objective ---------- = Subjective

FINANCE	FACILITIES	STAFF	STUDENT	PROGRAM	PURPOSE

Role of a Researcher: Free to interact with all elements.

Tangibles ---------- = Intangibles

His discussion focused on the relationship among the various elements and the role of the researcher in gathering and disseminating information about each of the elements. He suggested that each element impinges on each other element in some way and indicated a possible starting point for institutional studies could be with the characteristics of the students, accumulating historical data, noting trends, and extrapolating.

The USOE has published an Inventory of Facilities which might be of interest to those contemplating studies of space utilization, and he further mentioned a new publication on financing higher education recently published by A.C.E. Efficiency and effectiveness of operation in all elements of the institution depend upon appropriate data obtained from institutional research studies.

Dr. Drewry defined institutional research as the kind of information basic to making decisions about the institution and he emphasized the necessity for adequate information for purposes of control and planning. He suggested that those interested in evaluation of instruction might contact Dr. M.C. Wittrock, Director of a new Center for the Study and Evaluation of Instructional Programs, U.C.L.A.

In response to questions about the funding of institutional research programs, it was suggested several institutions within an area might enter into a consortium arrangement and share the salary of an institutional research specialist or seek assistance from four-year institutions willing to assist.

Dr. Knoell distributed a publication of the Association for Institutional Research and noted each developing institution had received a copy of "Memo to the Newcomer to the Field of Institutional Research." She stressed the necessity of gathering information about student characteristics both cognitive and non-cognitive, and suggested attention be given to those characteristics which could be modified in the institutional environment.

Appropriate tools or lack of them for appraisal of the various dimensions of the college environment were mentioned. It was noted that Dr. Vernon Hendrix of Dallas (Assistant to the Chancellor) had developed normative data for CUES for junior colleges which he may be willing to share. Emphasis on proper planning prior to undertaking research projects focused on the need to ask "why" the data is needed, prior to "what" data is needed.

Dr. Knoell suggested the development of research design models which might be of value and indicated a willingness to promote the development of such models for developing institutions, if college officials feel they would be of assistance.

14. STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES

Round 1
Chairman: Jane Matson; Recorder: James Kiser; Panelists: Jerry Bray, John Davitt

After discussing facets of student services that the group felt deserved special attention, two conclusions of a general nature were reached:

1) It is essential that the student personnel program in a junior college be in harmony with the mission and philosophy of the institution.

2) It is important that the program relate to the instructional processes of the college.

Of those services which are ascribed to student personnel services in the junior college, the following received special emphasis:

1) Student activities should complement the educational program and direct student involvement is important in the administration of such a function.

2) Student housing falls within the purview of student services and should be considered as consultants visit colleges having residence halls.

3) Financial aids - all avenues should be explored to provide scholarships, loan funds, work-study opportunities, etc. The program should be clearly communicated to the students and prospective students.

4) Health services - knowledge of the physical and emotional health of students is essential. This is an area that goes begging in many public junior colleges.

Other issues:

5) Staffing - often adequate staffing will be forthcoming if student services are well organized and viable.

6) Visibility of program - student services should be organized so that functions are easily identified by the faculty and lay community.

7) Financing - reference was made to a California publication on guidelines of student personnel services which provides information in this area (see consultants' handbook).

8) E.P.D.A. assistance might be secured in the area of in-service training by working with college and university graduate schools.

***

(continued)

14. STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES (cont.)

Round 2
Chairman: Jane Matson; Recorder: Stuart Steiner; Panelists: Don Creamer, Philip Speegle

1) Community Guidance Services - Some community colleges are getting into "reaching out" programs for the community. Also discussed was minority group recruitment, the ways to convince minority groups that the institution is truly an "open door" one. Some ways of attracting them are the following:

Recruit minority group faculty members (especially from graduate schools);
Take successful minority group students into community and high schools to recruit with you;
Provide the kind of programs that these students can experience some success with.

2) Remedial Programs - The ability of these programs to "repair" all of the students' shortcomings in the traditional five week summer session or in one semester was questioned. It was felt that on the whole many of these remedial programs clearly do not do the job.

Macomb Community College has developed a program on curriculum for students who have academic limitations. The program is showing signs of success in areas of:

Lower drop-out rates; better grades; success in transfer; and
a more relevant curriculum for the students.

One of the strong positive points was the credit given for taking some of the non-traditional courses in this program. El Centro in Dallas has a similar program in operation. Tarrant Co. Junior College in Fort Worth has also a similar program with many students expressing a desire to be admitted into the program.

"Vertical" faculty teaching teams were established. The students are placed on a block schedule and in some ways are separated from the other students. Their first semester consists of courses in the humanities, science (which has math), social science, communications, and career planning. There are no classes on Friday and this is used for field trips, etc. Some inherent problems in developing such a program are:

a. Getting the kinds of faculty members that have a real commitment to working with these students;
b. The program has a "showcase" look and this sometimes creates a feeling of animosity from other faculty members.

3) Faculty Advisement Systems - Jane Matson, Terry O'Banion and Joseph Fordyce are now making a study on this. There is a high rate of return on questionnaires sent out. The group discussed the use of non-professionals and computers in some colleges instead of faculty members for this job as "advisors." Also discussed was the use of women from the community for course advisement at Michigan State University and California State College.

15. STUDENT PERSONNEL: "Student Power"

Chairman: Joseph Fordyce; Recorder: Phil Speegle; Panelists: Russell Bloyer, Max Raines

Three major problems were discussed:

Why are students protesting?
Will these problems spread to junior colleges?
How can we handle these problems?

In discussing why students protest the following points were made:

1) We are now in an era of student power which is part of a cycle.
2) A small number of students are protesting.
3) Some, but not all, protestors are negatively oriented in their protesting.
4) As the real number of students increases, so will the real number of protestors increase.
5) Those students who are protesting are extremely active and vocal.

It was the opinion of the group that all colleges are vulnerable to demonstrations and protests. The best ways of preventing such disturbances are to:

Maintain an open line of communication with the students.
Provide an orderly, established procedure for handling complaints.
Make changes that are advocated without a confrontation whenever possible.

16. COMMUNITY RELATIONS: Public Service

Chairman: Ervin Harlacher; Recorder: Audrey Menefee; Panelists: Deon Holt, Joseph Rushing

The term "community relations" was not considered descriptive of the kinds of effort that characterize this aspect of the junior college program. "Public service" would be a more apt term.

Community service was said to be considered by the AAJC as the next major thrust of the American junior college movement. The junior college should be a genuine partner in the contemporary effort to deal with such problems as racial conflict, civil rights, urban renewal, upgrading of disadvantaged citizens, and poverty. Newer colleges have an advantage over established colleges because they can build into their planning a commitment to community services - cultural, educational, recreational, and social.

A junior college becomes a community college only when it accepts the community service function as being just as important as transfer education and occupational training. (A trustee in the group said that in order for community service to receive its full measure of recognition as a major component of the junior college function, it must have a total attitudinal commitment of the board of trustees. Where such a commitment does not exist, he suggested that "The school probably needs a new administrator who can sell the concept to the trustees.")

Some new campuses are being planned, including Monmouth, New Jersey, whose "campus" is seen as encompassing a 500-sq. mile area. The campus proper is described as a "security blanket" for students who need to attend classes within four walls. The college program is taken out to areas in the district, in vans and trailers; it is offered in store fronts, public libraries, and factories. Adults are not required to come to the campus at any time. Similar programs are currently in effect in Dallas, where counseling, occupational and career information are mobilized in trailers.

Many of these programs, on and off campus, can be self-sustaining. By calculating the cost of the program and projecting the number of persons to be served, a clue is provided to registration fees. Sometimes an industry or a public agency will pick up the tuition charge.

Advisory councils are being formed by some colleges, members of which represent private and public agencies involved in community action groups such as OEO and other anti-poverty programs which are often not aware of the opportunities available at the junior college. Since funds are going to these groups, the junior college should work through them more than it does at present. It should assume a greater leadership role than it has in the past.

For the traditional community relations type of work, it is still important to have it be coordinated by one person or one office, which has a close relationship to the college administration and can speak with responsibility and authority

on events as they affect the college. To get the story of a college out through the communications media, a relationship of mutual confidence and respect must be established. If the college spokesman answers questions with candor and willingness, rather than manipulating the news, he will gain the confidence of the press. "If you cooperate when they need it, they will cooperate when you need it." In brief, a college should place emphasis on community service, involve the public in its college programs, and then add the ingredient of continuous contact and interpretation of the college by a competent and responsible person.

17. COMMUNITY RELATIONS: Basic Problems

Chairman: Ervin Harlacher; Recorder: Marie Prahl; Panelists: Marshall Hamilton, William Robbins, Lawrence Fox

1) Dr. Ervin Harlacher reviewed the problems and issues he found in community service programs during his recent survey. Eight major problem areas were identified:

Communication of "community service" concept

Support of trustees, faculty, administration for community service programs

Coordination with existing agencies in the community and region

Process of working with advisory committees, making surveys, giving leadership

Planning and evaluating of community service programs

Setting objectives and formulating a philosophy

Administration and supervision of the program

Attaining financial support and physical facilities.

2) Fortunately, there are discernible trends toward the appointment of full time Directors of Community Services in the two-year colleges and some signs that there is thinking about the training and preparation of Directors of Community Services. Those attending the workshop agreed that there was a great need to survey a community and to prepare a community before launching a community services program. Each community presents a different combination of needs and what would be successful in one community would not necessarily be effective in another.

3) An article by Dr. Harlacher in the March 1968 Junior College Journal, and a forthcoming Prentice-Hall book, The Community Dimension of the Community Colleges, should be of interest to all involved in two-year college work.

18. COMMUNITY RELATIONS: Communication Problems

Chaiman: Shafeek Nader, AAJC; Recorder: Charles Rodrigues; Panelists: John Carhart, William Olsen

The following questions were raised:

How can the community college increase public knowledge of:
1) its existence in the community as a community component?
2) the comprehensive community college concept and philosophy of operation?
3) reciprocal planned "relating programs" between town and gown?

The college's public relations depend on how the college came into existence; if the college was founded through existing education channels, public relations problems are relatively minimal. However, in spite of good and comprehensive coverage by the media and cooperation, the public often fails to avail itself of college informational material.

The demographic situation and cultural establishment within the community influence the college's public relations techniques. To illustrate this, significantly large bond issues were passed two to one in a community where the college effected expert political analysis through the use of citizen participation led by PTA's in planning an information and action campaign. A previous attempt for passage of these same bond issues failed by two to one when the college tried to "go it alone."

The development of the public's acceptance and loyalty to the community college requires the involvement of carefully chosen community leadership in advisory and planning capacities.

Community spirit and community identity evolve when the college and its societal environment realize themselves as interacting components of community wholeness. The college facility is the nerve center, and the community is the campus, where the dynamics of community wholeness can occur.

OUR CHANGING TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

Dr. Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr.
Executive Director, AAJC

(Excerpts from a talk at the AAJC Conference on Planning for Development, Airlie House, Warrenton, Virginia, June 16, 1968)

I want to tell you that I'm very impressed by this occasion. I feel deeply about it because this meeting represents a greater marshalling of resources in our field, than any event that I can recall in my experience with the Association. This is quite different from an annual convention. This is a working meeting.

Let me share a few thoughts with you. Some of them have been stimulated by the planning for this conference, some by observations that I have had the privilege of making in the past decade or more--thoughts about our field, about our calling, about our work in junior colleges.

We have often been accused of defensiveness. Those who have been closely associated with the junior college field, I know, tend to have certain feelings that perhaps could be described as defensive. This is not justified. Our response ought to be simply to ask ourselves what is our job, and to proceed to become as competent as possible in doing our job. This is what this conference is all about.

Just a day or so ago, I was at El Camino College in California, in the Los Angeles area. I was sitting there in the stadium with 4000 people or more from the community in the stands, and 1050 graduates ready to walk across the stage to get their diplomas. Many of the names called were names like Yoshiyama, Yoshida, Takahashi, Valenzuela, Romero. The oldest graduate was born in 1904, the youngest graduate in 1949. I saw people from the Japanese and Mexican-American families who run the truck gardens and farms of that area. I saw fity or more women receiving their associate degrees in nursing, and I thought as I saw them of the important part we have played in that program--the tremendous impact this associate degree nursing program is having now in our country--the important social needs it meets. I saw graduates from the law enforcement program--hundreds in that institution are enrolled in police science. The police chief of a nearby community was one of those who walked across the stage. I saw a tremendous pride in the faces of all these people and a great sense of community involvement. During a luncheon that I attended there, a chorale group sang--some 24 voices--and I've never heard anything more beautiful. I visited the college theater and auditorium, with 2500 seats, which is used heavily for community service. They had a graduation ceremony there the night before for two of the junior high schools in the area, and the auditorium was filled up. That evening they were going to have a children's event, and it was to be filled again with another 2500 people. This is real use by the community. All this moved me deeply, and I thought this is what it's all about--this is it. This is what we are trying to do. I felt sorry for Reisman and Jencks that in their recent book, The Academic Revolution, they hadn't been able to discern this kind of thing. I don't think this is a defensive feeling; rather,

it is a great sense of pride in the educational movement that all of us are identified with. We have a particular kind of educational job to do and we are mighty glad to be involved in it.

And the kind of thing I saw there at El Camino College, I've had the privilege of seeing throughout this entire country. As all of you know, we have junior colleges now from Puerto Rico to Hawaii. There are almost a thousand junior colleges, and in most cases they have wonderful community support...

I believe our greatest need is to do as institutions what we must do as individuals, if we are going to live our lives effectively. It's a matter of trying to identify ourselves! "Who am I? What is my purpose? Why am I here? What is my calling?" This is what we must do as institutions, because it's only through a growing sense of identity that assurance comes, and it's only through this sense of assurance and importance that the capacity comes for innovation--for daring to be different--for trying new things--to be self-directed rather than other-directed--to work harmoniously and effectively with others. So we will eliminate defensiveness as we establish our own concept of our identity. In other words, we're big boys now, and now's the time to determine our own course, to marshall and utilize our own resources, and to evaluate honestly and capably our work, and to modify our program in the light of our evaluation.

I think it's a tremendously significant time for the community and junior college movement in America. We've been at it long enough now, and society's needs are such now, that we can and must develop this self-concept, this sense of pride, of self-identity, of self-directiveness. If we can't do that, this kind of workshop is going to be profitless, it will be of little value.

Now, one of the big opportunities before us, it seems to me, is leadership. And I don't mean leadership just in the junior college field: I think because of the resources we have and because of the commitment we must have in light of certain societal needs, we can do things now in the junior college field which will provide leadership for all of education. We are rapidly moving toward the day when opportunity will be provided for universal free education for at least two years beyond the high school. We will all have a part in it, or can have a part.

There are several areas in which I would hope we can exercise leadership. First of all, we need to change our concepts about who can learn, and under what circumstances. I've been very interested in the work done recently by Benjamin Bloom, a professor of education at the University of Chicago. He said each teacher begins a new term or course with the expectation that about a third of his students will adequately learn what he has to teach, another third will fail or just get by, and the remaining third will learn a good deal but not enough to be regarded as "good students."

This set of expectations is transmitted to the student through the grading procedures and through the methods and materials of instruction.

The system creates a self-fulfilling prophecy so that the final sorting of students through the grading process becomes approximately equivalent to the original expectations. He points out that this set of expectations fixes the academic goals of teachers and students and is the most wasteful and destructive aspect of the present educational system. It reduces the aspirations of both teachers and students, it reduces motivations for learning in students, and it systematically destroys the ego and the self-concept of a sizeable group of students. He says the cost of this system is reducing opportunities for further learning and alienating youth from both school and society is so great that no society can tolerate it for long.

And then he concludes that most students--perhaps over 90 per cent--can master what we have to teach them, and it is the task of instruction to find the means which will enable our students to master the subject matter. Our basic task is to determine what we mean by mastering the subject, and to search for methods and material which will enable the largest portion of our students to achieve such mastery. The whole concept of who can learn is being challenged. Our society is insisting that we can no longer consign people to failure in our educational institutions because we've not been flexible enough in organizing the most appropriate curriculum for these students or in establishing our procedures in such a way as to facilitate learning for more than 90 per cent of our students. Here is where we have a tremendous opportunity of leadership, because in no other institutions is there the heterogeneous student body that we have in our institutions--or ought to have.

More and more people are concerned not only with the characteristics of the people who are enrolling in their institutions, but also they're asking themselves: Who are the "ought-to-be students," who ought to be attracted to this institution? Under what circumstances will they come? And will they benefit by the program of this institution? This is where our institutions ought to exercise real national leadership.

And there's another area of leadership--the matter of the appropriate curriculum for universal education beyond high school. If we are going to assume that for more and more of our students--practically all of them coming out of high schools now, or those aged 18 or over who have not completed high school--for practically all of these people, some work beyond high school in an educational institution is going to be appropriate. What does this have to say about the kinds of educational experience they ought to have?

A very few years ago our preoccupation in the junior college field was with transfer programs almost entirely. We felt that the real "Good Housekeeping seal of approval" on our programs was if the university would accept our transfer students without loss of credit. This was the big thing. Time after time our programs and our ways of doing things--even our textbooks and the organization of courses--were determined by the university and four-year colleges to which our students presumably were going to transfer. We seldom took the time to look closely enough at the students to see whether they actually did transfer, or what institutions they attended.

Then we came to the time when we began talking more and more about technical programs or occupational programs, as you've been doing here, and we thought in terms of two streams--the transfer and the occupational. We somehow or other got the feeling that an institution was meeting the needs of its students if it had these two kinds of offerings, the transfer and the technical (sometimes called the terminal).

Now a few people are beginning to see that neither one of these is the complete answer. For more and more of our students we need different kinds of programs, programs that are neither university-oriented or occupationally-oriented, at least in the beginning. Are we really facing up to this? Now this is not a problem in our institutions alone. There are very,very few four-year colleges in which the lower division work is really responsive to the kind of need that I am identifying here. Let me put the question very simply, and you can answer it in terms of your own institution. What kinds of educational experiences are appropriate for our students if we are to assume that practically all of the people coming from high schools are going to be taking at least some education beyond the high school?

A commission of UNESCO that met recently in Moscow identified six goals of primary education, and it's this kind of thing that we must do now for the post-secondary years. Experts from 16 countries were defining the objectives for the first phase of general education covering the ages of six through ten. They said that in this first phase students should do six things: (1) learn to learn, that is to say, to observe, remember, reason, acquire information, use books, and work individually and in a group; (2) learn to communicate with others through reading, writing, speaking, in other words develop the capacities of attention, understanding and expression; (3) become acquainted with the values of the society to which they belong and learn to cooperate with members of the group, to familiarize oneself with different social roles, and learn tolerance and respect for others; (4) learn to develop one's own personality; (5) acquire general knowledge of the essentials of hygiene, nourishment, physical culture, and aesthetics; and finally, (6) prepare for continuing studies. These objectives wouldn't be bad, would they, for the post-secondary years?

I'm hoping that in the junior college field we can exercise leadership toward the development of organized educational experiences that will be responsive to this new objective in our society--to provide some educational experience for all beyond high school. Here is where we can give some leadership, and ought to, in our kinds of institutions.

The third and last area where I think we can exercise real leadership has to do with the community. Our communities are being fragmented by the development of freeways, throughways, urban renewal--all of these things are shattering the old concept of community, and if there's one thing we need in this country now it is to try to establish one society. The Commission on Civil Disorders brought this to our attention very emphatically. I'm finding as I go to various parts of the country that many junior colleges, both public and private, in the process of establishment and in setting up their programs, are creating new communities of interest. This in turn facilitates communication between sections of the larger community. Our institutions are playing

a role that in generations past was played by the church and by other organizations--they are becoming cohesive centers for community activity and reflection. Here, too, we have tremendous opportunities and is there anybody who would question the social need for this kind of activity?

I would like to describe a few of the things that we are doing in our organization, in our Association. Let me tell you the concept we have of this project. This is not an island of activity which is separated somehow from the rest of the things we are doing in the American Association of Junior Colleges. We like to feel that every one of our projects is an integral part of our total operation. So we are hoping for considerable impact from this Program with Developing Institutions on the rest of our activities, and this program in turn will benefit from the rest of the things that we are doing. One of our very important projects has to do with appropriate curricula and services by urban institutions. This program is funded partly by the Office of Economic Opportunity and partly by the Ford Foundation, which is making funds available so that we can study economic and psychological barriers that exist between Negro students and the community and junior colleges. Just to put an institution within reach of people is no assurance that the people are going to reach for it. We're going to try to find out why they don't reach and then on the basis of this, determine what we can do about it in our services and our programs.

Another new program on community service is funded by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. This is a three-year program, so the Association can begin to do much more in the field of community services than it has done heretofore. I believe that this field of community service is going to become one of our most important functions.

Another program, which dovetails nicely with this one of yours is for new institutions--those in the process of establishment. This is funded by Danforth Foundation for a three-year period. In order to be in the Program with Developing Institutions you have to be at least five years old; in order to be in the program for new colleges, you have to be younger than that. We've already identified some 200 junior colleges in process of establishment; and the Association will be working closely with state directors of junior colleges, with universities, other agencies, in trying to provide additional resources for institutions just getting started.

Then there is our Facilities Information Service. This, of course, deals with primarily physical facilities, and this is funded by the Educational Facilities Laboratories in New York.

We also have a program in occupational education, which has been described to you. There are four professionals working in that project, funded by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation with a five-year commitment of something over $1,500,000.

Still another AAJC project is on faculty manpower. We are trying to identify more clearly what needs, quantitatively and qualitatively, exist for

faculty in our institutions. This project is funded by the Carnegie Corporation.

Our program in student personnel is funded by a Carnegie Corporation grant. And under a Sloan Foundation grant we are making a study of the private junior college.

We also have an extensive publications program. Some 50 publications are now available to our constituents. This includes, too, our Junior College Journal. We are hoping that the Journal will get into the hands of every faculty member, board member and administrator in our institutions.

In our program on legislation, many of the things we are working on look toward obtaining new Federal resources for our colleges.

We have one other program that is about to get started under a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities. We are hoping this year to have some demonstration programs in the field of sociology, to show how the social sciences can be re-vitalized by greater utilization of community resources.

Those are a few of the things that we are doing as a national organization and all of these relate very closely to the work we are engaged in in this project. Let me close by posing a question or two for you. The other day one of the country's leading columnists said that a long-standing mark of this country's greatness has been its ability to make the most of available resources. He said that whether it was a mass of scrap iron, a bundle of used newspapers, or 40 acres of scrubby land, there was always someone who could turn it into something useful at a profit to himself and to society. He went on to say that we have been inclined to waste only our human resources, and that we seem to become more expert at this every month. I felt that he was saying something to us in our field. We know that in this nation only about 8 per cent of disadvantaged high school graduates attend college. The comparable figure for all high school graduates, as you know, is more like 50 per cent. I'm wondering--why it was necessary for Project Upward Bound to be initiated by the Office of Economic Opportunity? Was it simply because they had some money? Well, that's a good reason, but was it the only reason? Face up to it--was it? If our institutions were providing full educational opportunity, would not programs like Upward Bound be considered normal and continuing parts of the regular work? Isn't there some way our institutions could establish an effective relationship with high schools so that from the very early high school years individuals could be led toward appropriate educational experiences in community and junior colleges?

We know that many of our students are enrolled for one year or less. A large proportion will have no further college work before entering upon the responsibilities of citizenship and occupation. So, how realistic are the programs we now offer them? We know that as many as two-thirds of our enrollees will not transfer to four-year colleges and universities. How relevant, then is the present curriculum content of their needs? How appropriate are our curricula, and the ways we teach, if we are to serve more effectively the bottom half of the economic academic population as well as the upper half?

We know that many of our youth do not want a full-time college load. They want a job along with some college work. There's plenty of evidence that work experience programs will make sense to the student, and they provide him with substantial motivation for learning. Why don't we have more of these? In what ways can other out-of-school experience, including community service, be organized to connect with academic experience for increased motivation, for learning, and for greater sense of personal identity among students? What justification is there for the present pacing of formal education after high school? Our attendance patterns, credit and grading practices, course organization sequence, academic calendars--are they adequate? What new teaching-learning strategies are called for in one and two-year programs like tutoring, computer instruction, team teaching and other new approaches?

Now, our institutions have served many students well and they must continue to do that, but there's still ground for believing that neither the curricula nor the ways we teach are ideally suited to the increasing number of students the colleges must serve. This is a call for our institutions to accept a broad and distinctive mission. I think the Coordinating Council for Higher Education in California said this very well. By their history and legal mandate, California junior colleges are to complement- not mimic -the other segments of higher education. These junior colleges are particularly charged with providing services and programs not offered by the other institutions, to educate the more heterogeneous student body. We have, I think no work which could be more timely than this, no educational assignment more important.

New concepts of educability are developing, and our institutions can be in the forefront if they are secure enough in the perception of their task to be self-directed. I think the time will surely come in America with almost 1,000 junior colleges serving close to two million students, and with that number of students, incidentally, bound to double within the next five to eight years--the time has already come for these institutions to be less preoccupied with conventional definitions of "collegiate" functions, and more concerned about providing productive learning experiences. We need new methods that will enable people in all communities to learn to support themselves, to contribute toward the corporate life, and hopefully, too, to develop social perspective--and compassion for their fellows.